J. J. JAMES, Editor.

Devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, Agr zulture and General Intelligence.

G. MEREDITH & Co Proprietor

WHOLE NO. 1170

VOLUME XX. NO. 30.}

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1855

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER, A Religious and Literary Paper:

Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$2 00 per annum, payable in all cases in advance.

All letters on business should be directed to G. Merentri & Co., Raleigh, N. C. All letters containing communications, or in any way relating to the editorial department, should be addressed to Rev. J. J. James, or "Editor of the

All communications, to insure attention, must be directed to Raleigh, N. C.—post-paid.

For further particulars see last page.

THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS

Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered wishing to continue their 2. If the subscribers order the discontinuance of

their papers, the publishers may continue to send them till all cash charges are paid. 3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible until they have settled their bill, and order their paper discontinued. 4. If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the

ormer direction, they are held responsible.

5. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper or periodical from the office, or removing and leaving it uncalled for, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

From the Southern Weekly Baptist. Methodist Episcopacy-Interior View by Master Artists-Reply to the Rev. Mr. Hamill's fourth Letter.

(CONCLUDED.)

Turn we now to brother Hamill's fourth letter. And first of all, we cannot but congratulate our brother, on the evident improvement in the tone of the present as compared with his last communication. Its spirit is honorable alike to his head and his heart. "Richard is himself again."

"Methodism," then, is "Fair as the Sun, clear as the Moon, terrible as an army with banners!" How " fair," and how " clear" it is, we have been trying to discover. The father of it avers, in reference to that feature of it we are discussing, viz: its Episcopacy, that he had rather be called "a knave, or a foot, a rascal, a scoundrel, than to be called a bishop!" And if the reverend John Wesley could not steadfastly gaze upon its "fair" and "clear" disc, w thout "starting and shuddering," we suppose it must have been from the superabundance of the " terrible" which it exhibited. Of this, the reader will be able to form a better estimate as we proceed in our analysis of this " system of surpassing energy."

It seems that our brother cannot comprehend the difference between men and principles. If we express a personal regard to the members of the M. E. Church, and cannot; at the same time enlarge our throat to the dimensions of "our episcopacy,"-we have a wonderful knack of "twisting." On this principle, how supremely must Paul have despised Peter, when at " Antioch he withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." Personal regard cannot be indulged without involving fellowship in all the principles of the object of it! and therefore the command, requiring us to "love our enemies" must seal our lips in silence as to their errors and sins! We cannot expose these without the charge of "twistification." (Brother H. has declared, and is determined to maintain his independence of Web-

We were arguing the congruity between Methodist Episcopacy and English Episcopacy, and not English Monarchy, bro. H. True, it is not surprising that you mistook Episcopacy for Monarchy-they are par nobile fratrum-and the mistake you made is quite natural and significant.

Our brother plies the weapons furnished in Baptist Noel's armory with singular dexterity. He cannot draw too frequently on that rich collection of Episcopal facts. But we opine if "our episcopacy" had a voice, it would wring a most plaintive appeal in his ear—" from such a defence may the good Lord deliver me !"-Right glad are we, too, that something can provoke our good brother to laugh. We are happy to know that the frown which lowered so omfuously upon his brow so recently, is soon succeeded by the peels of merriment. That constitutional officers should not be privates is provokingly ludierous!

Brother Hamill represents as as saying that an Established Church in England is more democratic than the Methodist Church in the United States." The reader will remember that we said, if he, the Rev. E. J. Hamill (not we) could prove that we were mistaken in every point of the analogy we drew between the Methodist E. Church and the Established Episcopal Church of England, he would succeed in proving, that an established church in a Monarchial government was more democratic than the Methodist Episcopal Church in the free commonwealth of the United States. The perversion is so transparent that we really can-

not complain of it. As to our " evading the issue, and refusing to retract" the points specified, we are perfect-ly willing to "let the public judge between us" We should be inclined to indulge in bro. H.'s exercise a little, when he speaks of "evading issues," but we never could laugh on paper.

It is complained that we have asserted, that the "Bishops and clergy have imposed articles of faith upon their people without their consent." Now if the converse of this is true, it sent." Now if the converse of this is true, it can be proved. Who composed the General Conference at which the doctrines, discipline, rules and regulations of the Methodist Episcopal Church were adopted? The Bishops and travelling preachers. Were they delegated by their Churches to do this? Why this is not pretended. The lay membership of that church had no more connection with its governmental, doctrinal, and disciplinary organization, than the aborigines of this continent. And from that time to this the Bishops and clergy are the source and fountain of all power, spiritual and temporal, which the system involves. And it militates not in the slightest degree against this fact, that persons, in joining the M. E. Church, impliedly submit themselves to its entire economy. This proves no more for Episcopacy omy. This proves no more for Episcopacy than it does for Roman Catholicism. The question recurs in each instance, was the original authority which established that economy

were inspired, and "Discipline" is of equal authority with the New Testament. If from the churches, show us the authority, and we are dumb.

There is a singular fatality attending bro. H.'s quotations. He has treated us to a couplet from Hudibras, which so beautifully illustrates " our episcopacy," that we cannot resist the temptation to allude to it. There are those, doubtless,

"Who think religion is intended,"
For nothing else but to be mended." But who are they? Certainly not those who have no ecclesiastical legislatures—who suppose that Christ and his Apostles did all the legislation necessary for the churches in all ages who believe that the constitution, doctrines and discipline of these churches were drafted by the pen of inspiration, and therefore not likely to be "mended," by general conferences, or any other ecclesiastical assemblage.-Who are they, then, who suppose that religion may be " mended ?" For seventy-one years, the general conference has been tinkering with the "Discipline," and up to the last session

As we expect to discuss the " Book Concern," with the "appurtenances thereto annexed "in our next article, we shall decline any response to this part of bro. H.'s letter for the present.

of that body, they were still mending it. Some

twenty-one changes were made in it, we learn, at that time. "Our Episcopacy," however has been most sacredly guarded through all these

Episcopacy may well afford to place her mitre upon the heads of such men as McKendree and Bascomb, if for nothing else to purchase an indemnity from their merciless castigations. Now do not throw up your hands in holy horror, bro. Hamill, when we say that the mitre, when placed upon the head, will sometimes have the mysterious power to paralyze the tongue. It sometimes has the effect that your favorite Hudibras ascribes to money:

"What makes all doctrines plain and clear? About two hundred pounds a year, And that which was prov'd true before, Prov'd false again? Two hundred more."

Let us now look into bro. H.'s " parallels." In the first column we find John Wesley's name attached to two sentences, which we doubt not are genuine, though we could wish that he had given us chapter and verse. The first is this " I firmly believe I am a Scriptural Episcopos, (bishop) as much as any man in England. JOHN WESLEY" And so every settled pastor of a church on earth might have said the same, with equal propriety. Suppose our mutual friend and esteemed brother, Rev. T. Root, pastor of the Presbyterian Church in this place, should say that he was as Scriptural a bishop as any man on the American continent, would it be legitimate to publish it to the world that he, Mr. R, "preferred the episcopal mode of church government to any other?"- in the face, too, of a solemn declaration addressed to a Methodist bishop, that he would rather be called "a knave, a rascal, or secondrel than to be called a bishop?" Agair : If in the second sentence, Mr. Wesley uses the term bishop in the sense in which it was assumed by Messrs. Asbury and Coke, bro. H. has only succeeded in convicting his venerable spiritual progenitor of talking two ways, thus:

"Their father in the Lord may be called the Bishop, overseer of them all .- JOHN WES-

"Men may call me a knave, a fool, a rascal, or a scoundrel, and I am content; but they shall never by my consent call me a bish p. JOHN WESLEY.

And our reply to it shall be in the language of Paschal: "How happy it is to have to do with people that talk pro and eon! By this means you furnish me with all I wanted; which was, to make you confute yourselves."

A New Testament " Bishop must be blameless," a Methodist Bishop ought to be blame-

His second column contains two sentences taken alternately from the Methodist Discipline and Baptist Confession of Faith, and so arranged as to convey the impression that the extract from the Baptist Confession endorses the one from the Methodist. We do not wish to charge brother H. with garbling the extract from the Baptist Confession, for this would be unkind; but lef the reader glance at this extract of our brother, and read the following. which is the veritable paragraph he has mutilated. "9. The way appointed by Christ for the calling of any person fitted and gifted by the Holy Spirit, unto the office of Bishop, or elder in a church, is, that he be chosen thereunto by the common suffrages of the church itself; and solemnly set apart by fasting and prayer, with imposition of hands by the eldership of the church," &c. The election and consecration of a Methodist bishop at a general conference by the clergy, and the election and ordination of a New Testament bishop by the church and its eldership, are as far asunder as the east is from the west. And yet the latter is so mutilated and tacked on to the other, as if there were a particle of affinity between them! Surely, surely, it cannot be the defence of truth which requires a resort to such expedients as

We suppose Mr. Wesley knew what struction to place upon his own act, and what he was writing when he addressed the letter to bishop Asbury, four years after he and Dr. Coke assumed that title. It is a little singular, that when he makes a thrust at " our episcopacy," it is all " occasioned by the misreprepacy, "It is all "occasioned by the misrepre-sentation of others;" while in every other res-pect he is believed and obeyed almost as im-plicitly as if he were inspired. It seems as if there is but one thing on earth that the Methodist elergy love better than they do John Wes-ley—and that is "our episcopacy." John must not touch that—if he does, why "the dear old man" has been miserably duped.

For the sake of unity in this discussion, we have tried to avoid all side issues up to this time. For this purpose, we have permitted much that brother Hamill has said vitally affecting our own denomination, to pass without comment. But a sense of duty constrains us to depart from this course at this stage of the discussion—not that we intend to be drawn from the main question—but by way of a short episode, to vindicate our own church polity from some of the wildest and most puerile attacks it has ever been our fortune to ob-

serve. Our brother has set us the example of comparing the relative claims of Methodist and Baptist church government to the favorite consideration of American freemen. We are willing, therefore, that he shall have all the credit and honor of any victory he may obtain over us in this respect, and deposit his laurels upon

the altar of "our episcopacy."

1. The first question that suggests itself in this connection is, Who are the legitimate constituency of a gospel church? With the New Testament in our hands, there can be no difficulty in answering this question. Those who repent of their sins, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and publicly profess that faith by submitting to the ordinance of haptism. In other words, those who have been "born of the Spirit—born of God—called to be saints—justified—sanctified." We prove this, first, from the commission—"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved"-and secondly, from the manner in which the Apostles themselves understood it -" They that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls:" " And the Lord added unto them daily such as should be saved." " And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized," &c., &c. The truth is, there is no a recorded instance in the New Testament of any person being received into the church without furnishing reasonable evidence that he had exercised " repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." And that such and such only were the constituency of all the churches planted by the Apostles, is evinced from the additional fact, that all the A postolic epistles are addressed to them as such - 'to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus. called saints-beloved of God-the faithful in Christ Jesus-the saints in Christ Jesus-faithful brethren in Christ-brethren belovedwhose faith grew exceedingly," &c., &c. No man can doubt that if the Apostles uniformly applied such terms as these to the churches to whom they directed their cpistles, they must have been composed professedly at least, of new creatures in Christ Jesus"-converted to God by the Holy Spirit.

II. The second question to be considered is, whether these persons-these saints-faithful brethren in Christ Jesus, &c. - are competent to govern themselves. If they are not, who on earth are competent to the task? The very object of the gospel economy is to teach man this lesson, and to enable him to exemplify it in his relations to the Church. Solomon says, " He that ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city." Is a king considered competent to govern? The Christian is called also a king. Is a priest? He is called "the highest style of man." Is there any other character on carth superior to him, in this respect, to whom he can apply for guardianship? As a nation, we have announced the doctrine to an astonished world, that man is capable of self government; and shall we, in our ecclesiastical organizations nullify that doctrine among ourselves? Shall we proclaim on our civil constitution one thing, and on our ecclesiastical constitutions the reverse? We repeat, if Christians are not competent to govern themselves, who beneath the canopy of heaven are.

III. The third question suggested is, Wheth er the New Testament has inculcated any form of Church government? If it has, we are capable of discovering it; if it has not, then the man of God cannot be thoroughly furnished to every work. Now, we affirm, that the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ is the Constitution of a Gospel Church-that the governmental, doctrinal and disciplinary economy of the kingdom of Christ is set forth in that holy volume so luminously " that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein" -that " the Bible and the Bible only, is the religion of" christians-and that to affirm differently, is either to charge folly upon the Triune God, or unfaithfulness upon the sacred writers, to submit ourselves to the blind guidance of blind, self-constituted, and presumptuous priests, who assume the prerogatives of God himself; and to land finally within the crushing embraces of this spiritual Moloch, the Roman Catholic hierarchy. And we believe that this Holy Volume teaches the doctrine that

Christians are capable of governing themselves. IV. The fourth and last question that we shall now suggest, arising out of this subject, is the GREAT QUESTION, over which the conflict of every age since episcopal government has set up its impious claim against Church Government, has been waged; and it is the question we are now discussing: Do the churches belong to the Ministry? or conversely, do the Ministry belong to the churches? We give the question this double form, so as to present to the reader the whole subject matter in con-troversy in a nut shell. - Episcopacy maintains an absolute proprietorship in the churchesassumes to establish its doctrines and discipline appoint its pastors; change their locations at discretion; to receive and suspend preachers as necessity may require; to oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the church—in a word, it assumes all the attributes, rights, privileges and immunities of a supreme irresponsible government. Now, in opposition to all these extra judicial and impious claims to ecclesiastical powers and prerogatives, we main-tain that THE CHURCH of our Lord Jesus Christ -called in the Scriptures his "body"-" the Bride the Lamb's wife"-" royal priesthood, holy nation, peculiar people," &c.—has been invested with all the prerogatives and powers which her ascended Head has ever conferred upon any agency under heaven. The great Magua Charta of our spiritual commonwealth confers upon her, under Christ, the sole exercise of ecclesiastical power. This is our entrenchment. It has been planned by infinite trenchment. It has been planned by infinite wisdom, built by infinite power, and guarded by infinite goodness. It is a bulwark of strength which has withstood the lapse of ages, and the waste of empires—the menaces of kings, the assaults of Episcopaey, and the thunders of the Vatican. And it will continue to tower in majesty and glory until Daniel's sublime prophecy shall be fulfilled: "And the kingdom under the whole heavens, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominious shall serve and obey him." Into the hands of such a constituency, it is afe to deposite this power—for then the highest guar-

anties that heaven can give and that earth can receive, are furnished that it will be wielded only for good. The truth is, according to the New Testament, the Church can only exist to do good. The very moment she perverts the power committed to her hands to base and unworthy purposes, she ceases to be a church of Christ, and becomes a sect and synagogue of Satan. - These are some of the essential organic elements of Baptist Church polity. Are they anti-republican?

We have barely touched upon these topics but our space will not allow us to expand them. This we shall do as soon as the present discussion is disposed of. A single remark will dispose of everything bro. H. says in regard to Ministers' and Deacons' Meetings, Associations, Conventions, &c. In his second communication he observed he objected to such assemblages as these among the Baptists, because they were merely advisory councils: in his present one he objects to one of these meetings, recently held in Tuskegee, because its action on a query, " was the nearest approach to taxation proper and almost without representation, he has ever known in any church in our free country." At one time they are merely advisory councils, at another they pass a " decree" to which, if the churches submit, they "bear off the palm from all, of docility and submission to the powers that be !" Rather hard pressed for, "argument to answer argument." Who is "twisting?" And what do you think, reader, was this terrible crime against "our free country?" 1st. A query was suggested by a certain brother, a private member, to this effect. What is the best method of raising the funds to defray the necessary expenses of the church? The answer was, that each man ought to pay in proportion to his worth, according to the divine rule, " Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16, 2. 2nd. That covetousness was idolatry, and that, in the judgment of that meeting, no idolator ought to be retained in church. What monstrous offence this! how shocking to the delicate sensibilities of our brother! What profound concern does he manifest for the bonor of his country! All this, too, the mere expression of an opinion by a voluntary meeting! A privilege guaranteed to, and exercised by every public meeting of the citizens of this tree country, upon all sub-

jects of common interest! We suppose that we must inform brother H. that all forms of government may be abused. not excepting democracies. It is a significant fact, that the very arguments he is using against the Baptist polity, are the identical arguments which monarchists have always used against popular government. He has picked up a few cases in our histories, in which, under the strong excitement of some vexed question, a few of our churches have abused their power, and turns these against us, when he Limself will admit that they are the exceptions and not the rule; just as the apologists for royalty eatch up those occasional outbreaks, particularly in our large cities, and construe them into arguments against republicanism. We challenge brother H. to show any strifes in the Baptist Churches more dishonorable to the Christian name, or more destructive of human rights than those which agitated the M. E. Church in 17-98-1824-'28 and '44-and then, growing out of the last, the humiliating spectacle of the M. E. Church South versus the M. E. Church North, before the United States Court in New York, in reference to the "mammon of unrighteousness," in the famous Book Concern Lawsuit. A pretty fair evidence, this, that Episcopacy cannot meet every emergency, it may precipitate upon itself.

Bro. H. maintains that without the vote of the laity, none can be received into the intinerucy, or into the church. In the Discipline are the tollowing questions and unswers : " Quest. 1. How is a preacher to be received? Ans. 1. By the annual conference. 2. In the interval of a conference by a bishop, or the presiding elder of the district, until the sitting of the conference"-p. 37. Again : " Quest. 1. What are the duties of the elder, deacon, or preacher, who has the especial charge of a circuit? Ans. 4. To appoint all the leaders, and change them when he sees it necessary. 5. To RECEIVE. TRY, and EXPEL members, according to the form of the Discipline." Now, brother H., tells us one thing, the Discipline tells us the very reverse. And moreover, we have been present time and again, at the reception of members into the M. E. Church, and never have we heard the concurrence of the church asked in a single instance. Perhaps this part

of the Discipline has been "mended." Father Mercer's wish in regard to a general meeting of the ministers of Georgia, was certainly right and proper. But that the expression of such a wish should ever have been metamorphosed in a desire for a " conference episcopacy," we are sure never could have entered the head of any other person except a Methodist clergyman. A voluntary conference of ministers, for mutual edification and spiritual improvement, is quite a different thing from an ecclesiastical body assembled to enact, expound and enforce laws upon the churches.

We had intended to compare the constitution of Methodist Episcopacy with the constitution of the United States, after the example of our brother; but our columns are filled, and we are obliged to defer it until week after next. Justice to our correspondents requires that we shall give at least every other issue to their communications. We think we shall be able to make this part of the subject interesting in some

respects.

As our brother is still haunted by that hydra-headed monster among the Baptists, "close communion," and as he still seems to consider communion," and as he still seems to consider that it has much to do in reflecting light upon the "democratic element" in "our episcopacy," we suppose we must devote a single paragraph to the elacidation of that subject. Our position is, That the Baptists act, not only upon divinc authority, but also upon a principle adopted by every denomination of Christians on earth, so far as we know. That principle is, that Baptism is an indispensable pre-requisite to sacramental communion. In the Methodist Discipline, pages 86–287, the following question and answer occurs. "Quest. How shall we prevent improper persons from insinuating themselves into the church? Aut. 1. Let none be received.

into the church until they are recommended by a leader with whom they have met at least six months on trial, AND HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED." Probationers may be allowed to commune, "provided they have been baptized," says Remington, who was twenty years an elder in that church, "and not without." And with this agrees "Hibbiard on Baptism," a work endorsed by the General Conference of the M. E. Church, and recognized as a text book for young ministers, for the third year in their course of study. On page 174, he says: "It is but just to remark, that in one principle, the Baptist and Pedo-baptist Churches agree. They both agree in rejecting from communion at the Table of the Lord, and in denying the rights of church fellowship to all who have not been hap-tized. Valid baptism they consider as essential to constitute visible church membership. This ALSO WE HOLD. The only question, then, that here divide us is, what is essential to valid baptism.', The conclusion, then, is inevitable, if we are to believe their own standard authors, that the Methodist E. Church hold, that Baptism is a pre-requisite to the Lord's Supper, and the door of admission into the church. If brother H. will turn to the 213th page of Hall's Works, a volume from which he has often quoted, and with which he seems peculiarly charmed, he will receive the following rebuke from the " eloquent open communion Baptist : "Let it be admitted that baptism is, under all circumstances, a necessary condition of Church-fellowship, and it is IMPOSSIBLE for the Beptists to act otherwise. The recollection of this may suffice to rebut the ridicule, and silence the clamor of those who loudly condemn the Baptists for a proceeding which, were they but to change their opinion on the subject of baptism, their own principles would compel them to adopt. They both concur in a common principle from which the practice deemed so offensive is the necessary result. Considered as an argumentum ad hominem, or an appeal to the avowed principles of our opponents, this reasoning may be sufficient to shield us from that of reproach to which we are often exposed, nor ought we to be censured for acting upon a system (principle?) which is sanctioned by our accusers." With what sincerity can he, or indeed the pedo baptists generally, use the arguments of Robert Hall on the communion question, they all, as denominations, without exception, when equally with Baptists, repudiate his premises? No, brother Hamill, you have certainly too much perception not to see. that the legitimate question at issue between Baptists and Pedo-baptists, relates to baptism, and not sacramental communion. It is close

baptism, Nor close communion. Our brother takes leaves of us this time rather abruptly. A slight frown gathered upon his brow! Don't be crusty, brother H. If you have succeeded in "answering argument with argument," you ought to have quit in a better humor. We are not conscious of having used reproachful or insulting language to him; and as we are an alien, and bave never been accustomed to a " will omnipotent in the premises," we answer his clerical command of "silence !"-pardon us if we know no such right, if we comprehend no such privilege!"

> From the Puritan Recorder. Business and Religion.

As religion consists in doing our whole duty buisness, secular busin ss, is so far from being opposed to it, that it is in fact an essential part of the same. Constituted and as we are. we cannot do without it. As it is right, nay, necessary to provide food, clothing, and habitations for ourselves and those depending onus, so most men certainly must give portions of their time and attention to some secular calling, in order that they may be able to make such provisions. Providence, by withholding its supplies from every other source, indicates his will that we should put forth our energies and activities, so that we may be able in this way to gain what is needdful for us. Besides, we cannot perform our part in the common work of humanity. in ministering to the poor, or in sending the Gospel to the destitute without the avails of some secular calling diligently and carnestly pursued.

Business and r ligion, taking the latter in the more devotional view of it, ought to be regarded as inseparably united, both being involved in the larger and more comprehensive idea of religion itself. I mean to say, the same man who is to love, worship, and serve his Creator spiritually, is to gain his bread by the sweat of his face. While his relations to the future world, require temporal cares and labors corresponding with it. His motto is, or should be, diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.

But then I deem it important to observe, 1. That there may be business without relig-

ion: or, in other words, business, as is too often the case, may be divorced from religion .-It may be pursued with such a spirit, and in such a manner, that God will look upon those engaged in it as aliens from himself. This will always be the case, if we pursue it without any sense of dependence, or any regard to the divine will; or if our only aim be to please ourselves—to acquire, that we may gratify our avarice, or minister to our pleasure, or make a show, or gain power and influence for worldly ends. Business thus pursued, degenerates into mere self-seeking and unsanctified worldliness; and those who are the most successful in it may be as far as possible from the kingdom of God. Nay, worse than this; it may be that business is not only unsanctioned by any religious principle or motive, but is in reality a sys-tem and work of friend. It may be so pursued as to be wholly corrupt in its temptations, which, if not resisted by religious means, its motives, and its ends. It has always temptrtions,

motives, and its ends. It has always temptrions, will overcome the integrity of the man. Too many, alas! are overcome by these, so as to yield to the meanest and wickedest of arts in order to accelerate their acquisitions.

And then, men become so absorbed by business, as to be changed into mere sordid, unscrupulous, worshippers of Mammon. Their whole being is secularized, so that with them, money is the measure of the man,—the end and consummation of human existence. But,

2. While it is thus true, that there may be having a without religion, the consumers of this

asiness without religion, the converse of this There can never be,—as most men are cir-amstanced,—religion without business. The

latter is absolutely required by the constitution of our nature, by our wants, and by the arrange ments which God has made, that we may b the best qualified for heaven. Experience shows, also, that the pursuing of both,—I mean business and religion,—in close union, and in the same spirit, is not only practicable, but just that which we need, in order to secure the best formation of character. Certainly there is no gain but great loss, if we under-take to pursue religion to the neglect of busi-ness, or yield to the impression that the com-mon cares and avocations of life are incompati-ble with the high spirituality we wish to attain to. These cares and avocations, if sustained in the fear of God and with the in the fear of God and with the aim and desire of serving him, constitute a part of religion itself, and a part, as acceptable to heaven as any other. The idea that devotion, that worship, that religion, is something away from the common pursuits of life, is one to which the Saviour gave no sanction by precept or example, and one which derives no countenance from experience. So far is it from being true that religion is hurt, or hindered, by a proper attention to business, that the former flourishes only when pursued in connection with the latter. On the other hand, so far is it from being true that business is hurt or hindr d by religion, that we find none more truly successful in life, than those who make religion the presiding divinity in their hearts, their families and in all their plans of life. If it be admitted that men sometimes, by wicked art and management, by unscrupulous dealings, by friend, by theft even, and robbery, get money, still does not the result of observation, in respect to all ill-gotten gains, justify the common prudential maxim, Honesty is the best Policy?

Christ's Legacy.

When Christ was about to depart to his Fa-ther, he left his sorrowing disciples a legacy, and not to them only but to all who believe in his name. It was not such a legacy as the ives. It was not wealth so ea red by the expectant legaters, and so often the cause of bitter dissension among them. It was no title to honor among men, no right to evercise lordship over any. It was peace, his own peace-" peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world give unto you."

The peace which the world gives is a false peace. It is a peace which is hollow an insecure. It is easily destroyed. Let trouble come and it is disturbed: let death come and it is destroyed. The peace which Christ gives is firm and lasting. It is the peace of God, a peace resting on the principles of the divine government, and hence as stable as those principles. It is peace with God. There reconciliation with God. The enmity to God is taken away The indignation of God towards the sinner is at an end. It is heart-peace. The passions no longer rage and occasion war in the s.ul. The voice which calmed the raging waters of the sea has said to them, peace, be still. It is peace of conscience, for the guilt of sin has been removed. It is peace with man, for the love of Christ has been shed abroad in the heart, removing every root of bitterness and enmity It is the peace of Christ, for it was purchased by him, and given by him, and will be preserved by him to all eternity.

This peace has with propriety been termed a legacy, because it becomes ours only through the means of Christ's death. But for his glorious atonement, we had never known this peace. In place of it, there would have been eternal war in the soul and eternal war with the princi-

ples of the divine government. It we have this peace, we can afford to be without many other things. We can afford to be without wealth; for we have that which the wealth of the world cannot buy. We can afford to have the enmity of the wicked, if need be, for the peace of God which passeth all understanding, is more than a sufficient recompefor all the evil they may occasion us. We can afford to be burdened by the cares incident to this world if they cannot disturb a single prop which supports our peace with God. We need not fear to go down into the valley of the shadow of death, if our peace there shall be as a

If we have this peace, we should at all times and in all circumstances manifest the spirit of peace. He who should receive a legacy of millions of dollars should exhibit a spirit of pecuniary liberality; much more should be who has received Christ's legacy manifest the spirit

Reader, have you received this legacy? and are you loving, acting, laboring, praying in the spirit of it? In a word, have you received Christ, who "is our peace?"— Y. Y. Ob.

WHAT IS BAPTISM?-Had the Greek word Boptizo, which denotes the principal action in this ordinance, been translated, in the English version of the New Testament, there would probably have been, among English readers, no dispute concerning its import. Had either of the English words, wash, or sprinkle, or immerse, been substituted for the Greek word, an English reader would instantly conceive an ap-English reader would instantly conceive an appropriate meaning. But UNHAPPILY our translators have retained to the original word, and contented themselves with merely changing its termination. By this means an English reader is deprived of his usual guide. There are no other applications of the word, in his own language, from which he can learn its import.—

The only expedient, therefore, of which he can avail himself, is to ascertain the import of the original word.—Adoniram Judson, September 27, 1812. ber 27, 1812.

READING PRAYERS IN CHURCH.—Henry Ward Beecher says he would as soon go a courting with his grandfather's love letters in his hand, as to go into the pulpit and read the "common prayers" written in the dark ages by the Catholics, and now used by Episcopalians. Well said. And I suppose the Father of our Spirits no more regards such prayers than a young belle would one of grandpapa's old love letters. How would our earthly father regard us if we should come with our requests all written out and printed! The whole subject of written and printed! The whole subject of written and printed prayers is at war witten christian develon, and is only suited formalists and national churches —Bunyan. Texas Bay